

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-10 are amended for form. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Le at the interview held June 11, 2009 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 5-8 and 10 are allowed, and for the indication that claims 1-4 and 9 would be allowable if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is overcome. Because the rejection is overcome for the reasons discussed below, the application is in condition for allowance.

I. The Specification Satisfies Formal Requirements

The Abstract is objected to because it needs to be provided on a separate page. Applicants respectfully assert that the Abstract was provided on a separate page when filed. Nonetheless, Applicants submit the filed Abstract as a substitute Abstract to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Claims 1-4 and 9 Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that the features "a time data" on line 7 and "a point of time" on line 8 of claim 1 lack proper antecedent basis. These assertions are respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the telephone interview, these features have proper antecedent basis. As discussed during the interview, "a time data" on line 7 corresponds to "a point of time" when said identification data is obtained, which is different from the feature, "a time data" in line 4 of claim 1. "The time data" in line 4 of claim 1 corresponds to "a point of time" when

said operating position data is obtained. Thus, as agreed during the telephone interview, claim 1 and claims 2, 3 and 9 depending therefrom, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Office Action asserts that the feature "said non-cast fishing gear" in claim 4, line 5, lacks proper antecedent basis. By this Amendment, claim 4 is amended to depend from claim 3, as suggested in the Office Action. Thus, claim 4 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/cfr

Attachment:
Substitute Abstract

Date: July 29, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--